

## **REMARKS**

Claims 5, 11, 12, and 16 have been canceled. Claims 1, 8, 23, and 24 have been amended to clarify the subject matter regarded as the invention. Claims 1-4, 6-10, 13-15, and 17-24 are pending.

The specification has been amended to overcome the objections to the specification.

The cancellation of claims 11, 12, and 16 renders moot the rejections under 35 USC 112.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-4, 7, 9, 10, 15, 18-20, 23, and 24 under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Blake and the remaining claims under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Blake in view of Fagone.

The rejection is respectfully traversed. With respect to claims 1, 23, and 24, Blake describes a “morphing honeypot” that responds over time to events or other conditions to expose new or different vulnerabilities. Blake [0042] – [0052]. Blake describes using “activity logs” to determine if a “different vulnerability” should be deployed, Blake [0069], but that is not the same as “capturing a state of the honey pot, including by creating a copy of data associated with the honey pot as compromised,” as recited in claims 1, 23, and 24. Likewise, changing the configuration of a honey pot over time in response to client interactions, see e.g., Blake [0070] – [0073], is not the same as detecting a “breach” that “indicates the honey pot has become compromised,” as recited in claims 1, 23, and 24 as amended. In fact, Blake seems to assume that the “morphing honeypot” has not been “compromised” but instead remains available to lure and monitor attackers. Finally, the reconfiguring described by Blake occurs over time while the honey pot remains online, which is not the same as “automatically redeploying the honey pot, including by reinitializing the state of the honey pot,” as recited in claims 1, 23, and 24 as amended. Therefore, claims 1, 23, and 24 are believed to be allowable.


The remaining claims depend from claim 1 and are believed to be allowable for the same reasons described above.

The foregoing amendments are not to be taken as an admission of unpatentability of any of the claims prior to the amendments. Reconsideration of the application and allowance of all

claims are respectfully requested based on the preceding remarks. If at any time the Examiner believes that an interview would be helpful, please contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 2-21-08



William J. James

Registration No. 40,661

V 408-973-2592

F 408-973-2595

VAN PELT, YI & JAMES LLP  
10050 N. Foothill Blvd., Suite 200  
Cupertino, CA 95014